

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 of the patent application were presented for examination. In the Office Action of September 11, 2008, claims 1-18 were rejected. The claims, as amended, are listed above. Accordingly, claims 19-26 are now pending for examination.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims and respond to the Office Action as follows:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Furthermore, claims 9-12 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, for failing to point out and distinctly claim subject matter of the invention.

As shown above in the listing of the claims, claims 1-12 have been canceled, thereby rendering the rejections moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 13-18 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flowers, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,533,174) ("Flowers") in view of Fenwick (U.S. Patent No. 5,412,771).

As shown above, claims 13-18 have been canceled, thereby rendering the rejections moot.

Double Patenting

Examiner has indicated that claims 8-12 may be rejected for double patenting, once the rejection under 35 USC § 112 has been overcome.

In response, Applicant has filed a terminal disclaimer herewith.

New Claims

Claims 19-26 are newly added. Applicant submits that neither Flowers nor Fenwick, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the limitations of claims 19-26.

Flowers is generally directed towards a font server that communicates with workstation 12 and a printer 14 (Abstract). More specifically, Flowers discloses customizing a font by remapping glyphs, rotating or scaling characters and symbols, or adding special kerning pairs of ligatures (3:2-5). Also, Flowers discloses translating fonts into a format compatible with the client's text processing system and operating system (3:9-14).

However, Flowers fails to recite the limitations of independent claims 19 and 22. For example, claim 19 recites "sharing data stored in the memory with the at least one software client." Additionally, claim 22 recites "receiving the glyph data descriptions in a glyph cache unit and determining if glyph data is in the glyph cache unit."

Fenwick is generally directed towards a technique for producing a font for creating a string of glyphs representing characters in a language having a handwritten, or other appearance (Abstract).

But Fenwick fails to cure the deficiencies of Flowers.

Thus, claims 19-26 are allowable over Flowers and/ or Fenwick.

CONCLUSION

Applicant's attorney believes this application is in condition for allowance.
Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

January 12, 2009

/Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr./
Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.
Reg. No. 30,801

Customer Number 62736

(650) 493-4540

(650) 493-4549